arXiv:1406.6434v1 [math.CO] 25 Jun 2014

THE NON-PURE VERSION OF THE SIMPLEX AND THE BOUNDARY OF THE SIMPLEX

NICOLÁS A. CAPITELLI

Abstract. We introduce the non-pure versions of simplicial balls and spheres with minimum number of vertices. These are a special type of non-homogeneous balls and spheres (NH-balls and NH-spheres) satisfying a minimality condition on the number of maximal simplices. The main result is that *minimal* NH-balls and NH-spheres are precisely the simplicial complexes whose iterated Alexander duals converge respectively to a simplex or the boundary of a simplex.

1. Introduction

A simplicial complex K of dimension d is *vertex-minimal* if it is a simplex or it has $d+2$ vertices. It is not hard to see that a vertex-minimal homogeneous (or pure) complex of dimension d is either an elementary starring $(\tau, a)\Delta^d$ of a d-simplex or the boundary $\partial\Delta^{d+1}$ of a $(d+1)$-simplex. On the other hand, a general non-pure complex with minimum number of vertices has no precise characterization. However, since vertex-minimal pure complexes are either balls or spheres, it is natural to ask whether there is a non-pure analogue to these polyhedra within the theory of non-homogeneous balls and spheres. NH-balls and NH-spheres are the non-necessarily pure versions of combinatorial balls and spheres. They are part of a general theory of non-homogeneous manifolds (NH-manifolds) recently introduced by G. Minian and the author [4]. The study of NH-manifolds was in part motivated by Björner and Wachs's notion of non-pure shellability [2] and by their relationship with factorizations of Pachner moves between (classical) manifolds. NH-balls and NH-spheres share many of the basic properties of combinatorial balls and spheres and they play an equivalent role to these in the generalized non-pure versions of classical manifold theorems. In a recent work [5], the results of Dong and Santos-Sturmfels on the homotopy type of the Alexander dual of simplicial balls and spheres were generalized to the non-homogeneous setting: the Alexander dual of an NH-ball is a contractible space and the Alexander dual of an NH-sphere is homotopy equivalent to a sphere (see [6, 8]). It was also shown in [5] that non-homogeneous balls and spheres are the *Alexander double duals* of classical balls and spheres. This result establishes a natural connection between the pure and non-pure theories.

The purpose of this article is to introduce *minimal* NH-balls and NH-spheres, which are respectively the non-pure versions of vertex-minimal balls and spheres. Note that $\partial\Delta^{d+1}$ is not only the d-sphere with minimum number of vertices but also the one with minimum number of maximal simplices. For non-pure spheres, this last property is strictly stronger than vertex-minimality and it is convenient to define minimal NH-spheres as the ones with minimum number of maximal simplices. With this definition, minimal NH-spheres with the homotopy type of a k-sphere are precisely the non-pure spheres whose nerve is $\partial\Delta^{k+1}$, a property that also characterizes the boundary of simplices. On the other hand, an NH-ball B is minimal if it is part of a decomposition of a minimal NH-sphere,

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 55M05, 52B70, 57Q99.

Key words and phrases. Simplicial complexes, combinatorial manifolds, Alexander dual.

i.e. if there exists a combinatorial ball L with $B \cap L = \partial L$ such that $B + L$ is a minimal NH-sphere. This definition is consistent with the notion of vertex-minimal simplicial ball (see Lemma 4.1 below).

Surprisingly, minimal NH-balls and NH-spheres can be characterized independently of their definition by a property involving Alexander duals. Denote by K^* the Alexander dual of a complex K relative to the vertices of K. Put inductively $K^{*(0)} = K$ and $K^{*(m)} = (K^{*(m-1)})^*$. Thus, in each step $K^{*(i)}$ is computed relative to its own vertices, i.e. as a subcomplex of the sphere of minimum dimension containing it. We call $\{K^{*(m)}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ the *sequence of iterated Alexander duals* of K. The main result of the article is the following

Theorem 1.1.

(*i*) *There is an $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $K^{*(m)} = \partial\Delta^d$ if and only if K is a minimal NH-sphere.*
(*ii*) *There is an $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that $K^{*(m)} = \Delta^d$ if and only if K is a minimal NH-ball.*

Note that $K^* = \Delta^d$ if and only if K is a vertex-minimal d-ball which is not a simplex, so (*ii*) describes precisely all complexes converging to vertex-minimal balls. Theorem 1.1 characterizes the classes of Δ^d and $\partial\Delta^d$ in the equivalence relation generated by $K \sim K^*$.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **Notations and definitions.** All simplicial complexes that we deal with are assumed to be finite. Given a set of vertices V , $|V|$ will denote its cardinality and $\Delta(V)$ the simplex spanned by its vertices. $\Delta^d = \Delta(\{0,\dots,d\})$ will denote a generic d-simplex and $\partial\Delta^d$ its boundary. The set of vertices of a complex K will be denoted V_K and we set $\Delta_K := \Delta(V_K)$. A simplex is *maximal* or *principal* in a complex K if it is not a proper face of any other simplex of K. We denote by $\mathsf{m}(K)$ the number of principal simplices in K. A *ridge* is a maximal proper face of a principal simplex. A complex is *pure* or *homogeneous* if all its maximal simplices have the same dimension.

$\sigma * \tau$ will denote the join of the simplices σ and τ (with $V_\sigma \cap V_\tau = \emptyset$) and $K * L$ the join of the complexes K and L (where $V_K \cap V_L = \emptyset$). By convention, if $\emptyset$ is the empty simplex and $\{\emptyset\}$ the complex containing only the empty simplex then $K * \{\emptyset\} = K$ and $K * \emptyset = \emptyset$. Note that $\partial\Delta^0 = \{\emptyset\}$. For $\sigma \in K$, $lk(\sigma, K) = \{\tau \in K :\ \tau \cap \sigma = \emptyset,\ \tau * \sigma \in K\}$ denotes its *link* and $st(\sigma, K) = \sigma * lk(\sigma, K)$ its *star*. The union of two complexes K, L will be denoted by $K + L$. A subcomplex $L \subset K$ is said to be *top generated* if every principal simplex of L is also principal in K.

$K \searrow L$ will mean that K (simplicially) collapses to L. A complex is *collapsible* if it has a subdivision which collapses to a single vertex. The *simplicial nerve* $\mathcal{N}(K)$ of K is the complex whose vertices are the principal simplices of K and whose simplices are the finite subsets of principal simplices of K with non-empty intersection.

Two complexes are *PL-isomorphic* if they have a common subdivision. A *combinatorial d-ball* is a complex PL-isomorphic to Δ^d. A *combinatorial d-sphere* is a complex PL-isomorphic to $\partial\Delta^{d+1}$. By convention, $\partial\Delta^0 = \{\emptyset\}$ is a sphere of dimension -1. A *combinatorial d-manifold* is a complex M such that $lk(v, M)$ is a combinatorial $(d-1)$-ball or $(d-1)$-sphere for every $v \in V_M$. A $(d-1)$-simplex in a combinatorial d-manifold M is a face of at most two d-simplices of M and the boundary ∂M is the complex generated by the $(d-1)$-simplices which are face of exactly one d-simplex. Combinatorial d-balls and d-spheres are combinatorial d-manifolds. The boundary of a combinatorial d-ball is a combinatorial $(d-1)$-sphere.

2.2. **Non-homogeneous balls and spheres.** In order to make the presentation self-contained, we recall first the definition and some basic properties of non-homogeneous balls and spheres. For a comprehensive exposition of the subject, the reader is referred to [4] (see also [5, §2.3] for a brief summary).

NH-balls and NH-spheres are special types of NH-manifolds, which are the non-necessarily pure versions of combinatorial manifolds. NH-manifolds have a local structure consisting of regularly-assembled pieces of Euclidean spaces of different dimensions. In Figure 1 we show some examples of NH-manifolds and their underlying spaces. NH-manifolds, NH-balls and NH-spheres are defined as follows.

Definition. An *NH-manifold* (resp. *NH-ball*, *NH-sphere*) of dimension 0 is a manifold (resp. ball, sphere) of dimension 0. An NH-sphere of dimension -1 is, by convention, the complex $\{\emptyset\}$. For $d \geq 1$, we define by induction

- An *NH-manifold* of dimension d is a complex M of dimension d such that $lk(v, M)$ is an NH-ball of dimension $0 \leq k \leq d-1$ or an NH-sphere of dimension $-1 \leq k \leq d-1$ for all $v \in V_M$.
- An *NH-ball* of dimension d is a collapsible NH-manifold of dimension d.
- An *NH-sphere* of dimension d and *homotopy dimension* k is an NH-manifold S of dimension d such that there exist a top generated NH-ball B of dimension d and a top generated combinatorial k-ball L such that $B + L = S$ and $B \cap L = \partial L$. We say that $S = B + L$ is a *decomposition* of S and write $\dim_h(S)$ for the homotopy dimension of S.



Figure 1. Examples of NH-manifolds. (a), (d) and (e) are NH-spheres of dimension 1, 3 and 2 and homotopy dimension 0, 2 and 1 respectively. (b) is an NH-ball of dimension 2 and (c), (f) are NH-balls of dimension 3. (g) is an NH-manifold which is neither an NH-ball nor an NH-sphere. The sequence (a)-(d) evidences how NH-manifolds are inductively defined.

The definitions of NH-ball and NH-sphere are motivated by the classical theorems of Whitehead and Newman (see e.g. [7, Corollaries 3.28 and 3.13]). Just like for classical combinatorial manifolds, it can be seen that the class of NH-manifolds (resp. NH-balls, NH-spheres) is closed under subdivision and that the link of *every* simplex in an NH-manifold is an NH-ball or an NH-sphere. Also, the homogeneous NH-manifolds (resp. NH-balls, NH-spheres) are precisely the combinatorial manifolds (resp. balls, spheres). Globally, a connected NH-manifold M is (non-pure) *strongly connected*: given two principal simplices $\sigma, \tau \in M$ there is a sequence of maximal simplices $\sigma = \eta_1, \ldots, \eta_t = \tau$ such that $\eta_i \cap \eta_{i+1}$ is a ridge of η_i or η_{i+1} for every $1 \leq i \leq t-1$ (see [4, Lemma 3.15]). In particular, NH-balls and NH-spheres of homotopy dimension greater that 0 are strongly connected.

Unlike for classical spheres, non-pure NH-spheres do have boundary simplices; that is, simplices whose links are NH-balls. However, for any decomposition $S = B + L$ of an NH-sphere and any $\sigma \in L$, $lk(\sigma, S)$ is an NH-sphere with decomposition $lk(\sigma, S) = lk(\sigma, B) + lk(\sigma, L)$ (see [4, Lemma 4.8]). In particular, if $\sigma \in B \cap L$ then $lk(\sigma, B)$ is an NH-ball.

2.3. **The Alexander dual.** For a finite simplicial complex K and a ground set of vertices $V \supseteq V_K$, the *Alexander dual* of K (relative to V) is the complex

$$K^{*V} = \{\sigma \in \Delta(V) \,|\, \Delta(V - V_\sigma) \notin K\}.$$

The main importance of K^{*V} lies in the combinatorial formulation of Alexander duality: $H_i(K^{*V}) \simeq H^{n-i-3}(K)$. Here $n = |V|$ and the homology and cohomology groups are reduced (see e.g. [1]). In what follows, we shall write $K^* := K^{*V_K}$ and $K^\tau := K^{*V}$ if $\tau = \Delta(V - V_K)$. With this convention, $K^\tau = K^*$ if $\tau = \emptyset$. Note that $(\Delta^d)^* = \emptyset$ and $(\partial\Delta^{d+1})^* = \{\emptyset\}$.

The relationship between Alexander duals relative to different ground sets of vertices is given by the following formula (see [5, Lemma 3.1]):

$$K^\tau = \partial\tau * \Delta_K + \tau * K^*. \qquad (*)$$

Here K^* is viewed as a subcomplex of Δ_K. It is easy to see from the definition that $(K^*)^{\Delta(V_K - V_{K^*})} = K$ and that $(K^\tau)^* = K$ if $K \neq \Delta^d$ (see [5, Lemma 3.1]). The following result characterizes the Alexander dual of vertex-minimal complexes.

Lemma 2.1 ([5, Lemma 4.1])**.** *If $K = \Delta^d + u * lk(u, K)$ with $u \notin \Delta^d$, then $K^* = lk(u, K)^\tau$ where $\tau = \Delta(V_K - V_{st(u,K)})$.*

It can be shown that K^τ is an NH-ball (resp. NH-sphere) if and only if K^* is an NH-ball (resp. NH-sphere). This actually follows from the next result involving a slightly more general form of formula $(*)$, which we include here for future reference.

Lemma 2.2 ([5, Lemma 3.5])**.** *If $V_K \subset V$ and $\eta \neq \emptyset$, then $L := \partial\eta * \Delta(V) + \eta * K$ is an NH-ball (resp. NH-sphere) if and only if K is an NH-ball (resp. NH-sphere).*

3. Minimal NH-spheres

In this section we introduce the non-pure version of $\partial\Delta^d$ and prove part (i) of Theorem 1.1. Recall that $\mathsf{m}(K)$ denotes the number of maximal simplices of K. We shall see that for a non-homogeneous sphere S, requesting minimality of $\mathsf{m}(S)$ is strictly stronger than requesting that of V_S. This is the reason why vertex-minimal NH-spheres are not necessarily *minimal* in our sense.

To introduce minimal NH-spheres we note first that any complex K with the homotopy type of a k-sphere has at least $k + 2$ principal simplices. This follows from the fact that the simplicial nerve $\mathcal{N}(K)$ is homotopy equivalent to K.

Definition. An NH-sphere S is said to be *minimal* if $\mathsf{m}(S) = \dim_h(S) + 2$.

Note that, equivalently, an NH-sphere S of homotopy dimension k is minimal if and only if $\mathcal{N}(S) = \partial\Delta^{k+1}$.

Remark 3.1. Suppose $S = B + L$ is a decomposition of a minimal NH-sphere of homotopy dimension k and let $v \in V_L$. Then $lk(v, S)$ is an NH-sphere of homotopy dimension $\dim_h(lk(v, S)) = k - 1$ and $lk(v, S) = lk(v, B) + lk(v, L)$ is a valid decomposition (see §2.2). In particular, $\mathsf{m}(lk(v, S)) \geq k + 1$. Also, $\mathsf{m}(lk(v, S)) < k + 3$ since $\mathsf{m}(S) < k + 3$ and $\mathsf{m}(lk(v, S)) \neq k + 2$ since otherwise S is a cone. Therefore, $\mathsf{m}(lk(v, S)) = k + 1 = \dim_h(lk(v, S)) + 2$, which shows that $lk(v, S)$ is also a minimal NH-sphere.

We next prove that minimal NH-spheres are vertex-minimal.

Proposition 3.2. *If S is a d-dimensional minimal NH-sphere then $|V_S| = d+2$.*

Proof. Let $S = B + L$ be decomposition of S and set $k = \dim_h(S)$. We shall prove that $|V_S| \leq d+2$ by induction on k. The case $k = 0$ is straightforward, so assume $k \geq 1$. Let $\eta \in B$ be a principal simplex of minimal dimension and let Ω denote the intersection of all principal simplices of S different from η. Note that $\Omega \neq \emptyset$ since $\mathcal{N}(S) = \partial\Delta^{k+1}$ and let $u \in \Omega$ be a vertex. Since $\eta \notin L$ then $\Omega \subset L$ and $u \in L$. By Remark 3.1, $lk(u,S)$ is a minimal NH-sphere of dimension $d' \leq d-1$ and homotopy dimension $k-1$. By inductive hypothesis, $|V_{lk(u,S)}| \leq d'+2 \leq d+1$. Hence, $st(u,S)$ is a top generated subcomplex of S with $k+1$ principal simplices and at most $d+2$ vertices. By construction, $S = st(u,S)+\eta$. We claim that $V_\eta \subset V_{st(u,S)}$. Since $B = st(u,B) + \eta$, by strong connectivity there is a ridge $\sigma \in B$ in $st(u,B) \cap \eta$ (see §2.2). By the minimality of η we must have $\eta = w * \sigma$ for some vertex w. Now, $\sigma \in st(u,B) \cap \eta \subset st(u,S) \cap \eta$; but $st(v,S) \cap \eta \neq \sigma$ since, otherwise, $S = st(u,S) + \eta \searrow st(u,S) \searrow u$, contradicting the fact that S has the homotopy type of a sphere. We conclude that $w \in st(u,S)$ since every face of η different from σ contains w. Thus, $|V_S| = |V_{st(u,S)} \cup V_\eta| = |V_{st(u,S)}| \leq d+2$. □

This last proposition shows that, in the non-pure setting, requesting the minimality of $\mathsf{m}(S)$ is strictly more restrictive than requesting that of $|V_S|$. For example, a vertex-minimal NH-sphere can be constructed from *any* NH-sphere S and a vertex $u \notin S$ by the formula $\tilde{S} := \Delta_S + u * S$. It is easy to see that if S is not minimal, neither is $\tilde{S}$.

Remark 3.3. By Proposition 3.2, a d-dimensional minimal NH-sphere S may be written $S = \Delta^d + u * lk(u,S)$ for some $u \notin \Delta^d$. Note that for any decomposition $S = B + L$, the vertex u must lie in L (since this last complex is top generated). In particular, $lk(u,S)$ is a minimal NH-sphere by Remark 3.1.

As we mentioned above, the Alexander duals play a key role in characterizing minimal NH-spheres. We now turn to prove Theorem 1.1 (i). We derive first the following corollary of Proposition 3.2.

Corollary 3.4. *If S is a minimal NH-sphere then $|V_{S^*}| < |V_S|$ and $\dim(S^*) < \dim(S)$.*

Proof. $V_{S^*} \subsetneq V_S$ follows from Proposition 3.2 since if $S = \Delta^d + u * lk(u,S)$ then $u \notin S^*$. In particular, this implies that $\dim(S^*) \neq \dim(S)$ since S^* is not a simplex by Alexander duality. □

Theorem 3.5. *Let K be a finite simplicial complex and let τ be a simplex (possibly empty) disjoint from K. Then, K is a minimal NH-sphere if and only if K^τ is a minimal NH-sphere. That is, the class of minimal NH-spheres is closed under taking Alexander dual.*

Proof. Assume first that K is a minimal NH-sphere and set $d = \dim(K)$. We proceed by induction on d. By Proposition 3.2, we can write $K = \Delta^d + u * lk(u,K)$ for $u \notin \Delta^d$. If $\tau = \emptyset$ then, by Lemma 2.1, $K^* = lk(u,K)^\rho$ for $\rho = \Delta(V_K - V_{st(u,K)})$. By Remark 3.3, $lk(u,K)$ is a minimal NH-sphere. Therefore, $K^* = lk(u,K)^\rho$ is a minimal NH-sphere by inductive hypothesis. If $\tau \neq \emptyset$, $K^\tau = \partial\tau * \Delta_K + \tau * K^*$ by formula $(*)$. In particular, K^τ is an NH-sphere by Lemma 2.2 and the case $\tau = \emptyset$. Now, by Alexander duality,

$$\dim_h(K^\tau) = |V_K \cup V_\tau| - \dim_h(K) - 3 = |V_K| + |V_\tau| - \dim_h(K) - 3 = \dim_h(K^*) + |V_\tau|.$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathsf{m}(K^\tau) = \mathsf{m}(\partial\tau * \Delta_K + \tau * K^*) = \mathsf{m}(\partial\tau) + \mathsf{m}(K^*) = |V_\tau| + \dim_h(K^*) + 2,$$

where the last equality follows from the case $\tau = \emptyset$. This shows that S^τ is minimal.

Assume now that K^τ is a minimal NH-sphere. If $\tau \neq \emptyset$ then $K = (K^\tau)^*$ and if $\tau = \emptyset$ then $K = (K^*)^{\Delta(V_K - V_{K^*})}$ (see §2.3). In any case, the result follows immediately from the previous implication. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (i). Suppose first that K is a minimal NH-sphere. By Theorem 3.5, every non-empty complex in the sequence $\{K^{*(m)}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is a minimal NH-sphere. By Corollary 3.4, $|V_{K^{*(m+1)}}| < |V_{K^{*(m)}}|$ for all m such that $K^{*(m)} \neq \{\emptyset\}$. Therefore, $K^{*(m_0)} = \{\emptyset\}$ for some $m_0 < |V_K|$ and hence $K^{*(m_0-1)} = \partial\Delta^d$ for some $d \geq 1$.

Assume now that $K^{*(m)} = \partial\Delta^d$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $d \geq 1$. We proceed by induction on m. The case $m = 0$ corresponds to the trivial case $K = \partial\Delta^d$. For $m \geq 1$, the result follows immediately from Theorem 3.5 and the inductive hypothesis. □

4. Minimal NH-balls

We now develop the notion of minimal NH-ball. The definition in this case is a little less straightforward that in the case of spheres because there is no piecewise-linear-equivalence argument in the construction of non-pure balls. To motivate the definition of minimal NH-ball, recall that for a non-empty simplex $\tau \in K$ and a vertex $a \notin K$, the *elementary starring* (τ, a) of K is the operation which transforms K in $(\tau, a)K$ by removing $\tau * lk(\tau, K) = st(\tau, K)$ and replacing it with $a * \partial\tau * lk(\tau, K)$. Note that when $\dim(\tau) = 0$ then $(\tau, a)K$ is isomorphic to K.

Lemma 4.1. *Let B be a combinatorial d-ball. The following statements are equivalent.*

(1) $|V_B| \leq d + 2$ (i.e. B is vertex-minimal).
(2) B is an elementary starring of Δ^d.
(3) There is a combinatorial d-ball L such that $B + L = \partial\Delta^{d+1}$.

Proof. We first prove that (1) implies (2) by induction on d. Since Δ^d is trivially a starring of any of its vertices, we may assume $|V_B| = d + 2$ and write $B = \Delta^d + u * lk(u, B)$ for $u \notin \Delta^d$. Since $lk(u, B)$ is necessarily a vertex-minimal $(d-1)$-combinatorial ball then $lk(u, B) = (\tau, a)\Delta^{d-1}$ by inductive hypothesis. It follows from an easy computation that B is isomorphic to $(u * \tau, a)\Delta^d$.

We next prove that (2) implies (3). We have

$$B = (\tau, a)\Delta^d = a * \partial\tau * lk(\tau, \Delta^d) = a * \partial\tau * \Delta^{d-\dim(\tau)-1} = \partial\tau * \Delta^{d-\dim(\tau)}.$$

Letting $L := \tau * \partial\Delta^{d-\dim(\tau)}$ we get the statement of (3).

The other implication is trivial. □

Definition. An NH-ball B is said to be *minimal* if there exists a minimal NH-sphere S that admits a decomposition $S = B + L$.

Note that if B is a minimal NH-ball and $S = B + L$ is a decomposition of a minimal NH-sphere then, by Remark 3.1, $lk(v, B)$ is a minimal NH-ball for every $v \in B \cap L$ (see §2.2). Note also that the intersection of all the principal simplices of B is non-empty since $\mathcal{N}(B) \subsetneq \mathcal{N}(S) = \partial\Delta^{k+1}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}(B)$ is a simplex. The converse, however, is easily seen to be false.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii) will follow the same lines as its version for NH-spheres.

Proposition 4.2. *If B is a d-dimensional minimal NH-ball then $|V_B| \leq d + 2$.*

Proof. This follows immediately from Proposition 3.2 since $\dim(B) = \dim(S)$ for any decomposition $S = B + L$ of an NH-sphere. □

Corollary 4.3. *If B is a minimal NH-ball then $|V_{B^*}| < |V_B|$ and $\dim(B^*) < \dim(B)$.*

Proof. We may assume $B \neq \Delta^d$. $V_{B^*} \subsetneq V_B$ by the same reasoning made in the proof of Corollary 3.4. Also, if $\dim(B) = \dim(B^*)$ then $B^* = \Delta^d$. By formula $(*)$, $B = (B^*)^\rho = \partial\rho * \Delta^d$ where $\rho = \Delta(V_B - V_{B^*})$, which is a contradiction since $|V_B| = d + 2$. □

Remark 4.4. The same construction that we made for minimal NH-spheres shows that vertex-minimal NH-balls need not be minimal. Also, similarly to the case of non-pure spheres, if $B = \Delta^d + u * lk(u, B)$ is a minimal NH-ball which is not a simplex then for any decomposition $S = B + L$ of a minimal NH-sphere we have $u \in L$. In particular, since $lk(u, S) = lk(u, B) + lk(u, L)$ is a valid decomposition of a minimal NH-sphere, then $lk(u, B)$ is a minimal NH-ball (see Remark 3.3).

Theorem 4.5. *Let K be a finite simplicial complex and let τ be a simplex (possibly empty) disjoint from K. Then, K is a minimal NH-ball if and only if K^τ is a minimal NH-ball. That is, the class of minimal NH-balls is closed under taking Alexander dual.*

Proof. Assume first that K is a minimal NH-ball and proceed by induction on $d = \dim(K)$. The case $\tau = \emptyset$ follows the same reasoning as the proof of Theorem 3.5 using the previous remarks. Suppose then $\tau \neq \emptyset$. Since by the previous case K^* is a minimal NH-ball, there exists a decomposition $\tilde{S} = K^* + \tilde{L}$ of a minimal NH-sphere. By Propositions 3.2 and 4.2, either K^* is a simplex (and $V_{\tilde{S}} - V_{K^*} = \{w\}$ is a single vertex) or $V_{\tilde{S}} = V_{K^*} \subset V_K$. Let $S := K^\tau + \tau * \tilde{L}$, where we identify the vertex w with any vertex in $V_K - V_{K^*}$ if K^* is a simplex. We claim that $S = K^\tau + \tau * \tilde{L}$ is a valid decomposition of a minimal NH-sphere. On one hand, formula $(*)$ and Lemma 2.2 imply that K^τ is an NH-ball and that

$$S = \partial\tau * \Delta_K + \tau * K^* + \tau * \tilde{L} = \partial\tau * \Delta_K + \tau * \tilde{S}$$

is an NH-sphere. Also,

$$\begin{aligned} K^\tau \cap (\tau * \tilde{L}) &= (\partial\tau * \Delta_K + \tau * K^*) \cap (\tau * \tilde{L}) \\ &= \partial\tau * \tilde{L} + \tau * (K^* \cap \tilde{L}) \\ &= \partial\tau * \tilde{L} + \tau * \partial\tilde{L} \\ &= \partial(\tau * \tilde{L}). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $S = K^\tau + \tau * \tilde{L}$ is valid decomposition of an NH-sphere. On the other hand,

$$\mathsf{m}(S) = \mathsf{m}(\partial\tau) + \mathsf{m}(\tilde{S}) = \dim(\tau) + 1 + \dim(\tilde{L}) + 2 = \dim_h(S) + 2,$$

which proves that S is minimal. This settles the implication.

The other implication is analogous to the corresponding part of the proof of Theorem 3.5. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1 (ii). It follows the same reasoning as the proof of Theorem 1.1 (i) (replacing $\{\emptyset\}$ with $\emptyset$). □

If $K^* = \Delta^d$ then, letting $\tau = \Delta(V_K - V_{\Delta^d}) \neq \emptyset$, we have $K = (K^*)^\tau = \partial\tau * \Delta^d = (\tau, v)\Delta^{d+\dim(\tau)}$. This shows that Theorem 1.1 (ii) characterizes all complexes which converge to vertex-minimal balls.

5. Further properties of minimal NH-balls and NH-spheres

In this final section we briefly discuss some characteristic properties of minimal NH-balls and NH-spheres.

Proposition 5.1. *In a minimal NH-ball or NH-sphere, the link of every simplex is a minimal NH-ball or NH-sphere.*

Proof. Let K be a minimal NH-ball or NH-sphere of dimension d and let $\sigma \in K$. We may assume $K \neq \Delta^d$. Since for a non-trivial decomposition $\sigma = w * \eta$ we have $lk(\sigma, S) = lk(w, lk(\eta, S))$, by an inductive argument it suffices to prove the case $\sigma = v \in V_K$. We proceed by induction on d. We may assume $d \geq 1$. Write $K = \Delta^d + u * lk(u, K)$ where, as shown before, $lk(u, K)$ is either a minimal NH-ball or a minimal NH-sphere. Note that this in particular settles the case $v = u$. Suppose then $v \neq u$. If $v \notin lk(u, K)$ then $lk(v, K) = \Delta^{d-1}$. Otherwise, $lk(v, K) = \Delta^{d-1} + u * lk(v, lk(u, K))$. By inductive hypothesis, $lk(v, lk(u, K))$ is a minimal NH-ball or NH-sphere. By Lemma 2.1,

$$lk(v, K)^* = lk(v, lk(u, K))^\rho,$$

and the result follows from Theorems 3.5 and 4.5. □

For any vertex $v \in K$, the *deletion* $K - v = \{\sigma \in K \mid v \notin \sigma\}$ is again a minimal NH-ball or NH-sphere. This follows from Proposition 5.1, Theorems 3.5 and 4.5 and the fact that $lk(v, K^*) = (K - v)^*$ for any $v \in V_K$ (see [5, Lemma 4.2 (1)]). Also, Remark 4.4 implies that minimal NH-balls are (non-pure) vertex-decomposable as defined by Björner and Wachs (see [3, §11]).

Finally, we make use of Theorems 3.5 and 4.5 to compute the number of minimal NH-spheres and NH-balls in each dimension.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $0 \leq k \leq d$.*

1. *There are exactly $\binom{d}{k}$ minimal NH-spheres of dimension d and homotopy dimension k. In particular, there are exactly 2^d minimal NH-spheres of dimension d.*
2. *There are exactly 2^d minimal NH-balls of dimension d.*

Proof. We first prove (1). An NH-sphere with $d = k$ is homogeneous by [5, Proposition 2.4], in which case the result is obvious. Assume then $0 \leq k \leq d-1$ and proceed by induction on d. Let $\mathcal{S}_{d,k}$ denote the set of minimal NH-spheres of dimension d and homotopy dimension k. If $S \in \mathcal{S}_{d,k}$ it follows from Theorem 3.5, Corollary 3.4 and Alexander duality that S^* is a minimal NH-sphere with $\dim(S^*) < d$ and $\dim_h(S^*) = d - k - 1$. Therefore, there is a well defined application

$$\mathcal{S}_{d,k} \xrightarrow{f} \bigcup_{i=d-k-1}^{d-1} \mathcal{S}_{i,d-k-1}$$

sending S to S^*. We claim that f is a bijection. To prove injectivity, suppose $S_1, S_2 \in \mathcal{S}_{d,k}$ are such that $S_1^* = S_2^*$. Let $\rho_i = \Delta(V_{S_i} - V_{S_i^*})$ $(i = 1, 2)$. Since $|V_{S_1}| = d + 2 = |V_{S_2}|$ then $\dim(\rho_1) = \dim(\rho_2)$ and, hence, $S_1 = (S_1^*)^{\rho_1} = (S_2^*)^{\rho_2} = S_2$. To prove surjectivity, let $\tilde{S} \in \mathcal{S}_{j,d-k-1}$ with $d - k - 1 \leq j \leq d - 1$. Taking $\tau = \Delta^{d-j-1}$ we have $\tilde{S}^\tau \in \mathcal{S}_{d,k}$ and $f(\tilde{S}^\tau) = \tilde{S}$ (see §2.3). Finally, using the inductive hypothesis,

$$|\mathcal{S}_{d,k}| = \sum_{i=d-k-1}^{d-1} |\mathcal{S}_{i,d-k-1}| = \sum_{i=d-k-1}^{d-1} \binom{i}{d-k-1} = \binom{d}{k}.$$

For (2), let $\mathcal{B}_d$ denote the set of minimal NH-balls of dimension d and proceed again by induction on d. The very same reasoning as above gives a well defined bijection

$$\mathcal{B}_d - \{\Delta^d\} \xrightarrow{f} \bigcup_{i=0}^{d-1} \mathcal{B}_i.$$

Therefore, using the inductive hypothesis,

$$|\mathcal{B}_d - \{\Delta^d\}| = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} |\mathcal{B}_i| = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} 2^i = 2^d - 1. \quad \square$$

Acknowledgement. I am grateful to Gabriel Minian for many helpful remarks and suggestions during the preparation of the paper.

References

[1] A. Björner, M. Tancer. *Combinatorial Alexander Duality – A short and elementary proof.* Discrete Comput. Geom. 42 (2009), No. 4, 586-593.
[2] A. Björner, M. Wachs. *Shellable nonpure complexes and posets. I.* Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 348 (1996), No. 4, 1299-1327.
[3] A. Björner, M. Wachs. *Shellable nonpure complexes and posets. II.* Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 349 (1997), No. 10, 3945-3975.
[4] N. A. Capitelli, E. G. Minian. *Non-homogeneous combinatorial manifolds.* Beitr. Algebra Geom. 54 (2013), No. 1, 419-439.
[5] N. A. Capitelli, E. G. Minian. *A generalization of a result of Dong and Santos-Sturmfels on the Alexander dual of spheres and balls.* Preprint 2014. `arXiv:1403.1291 [math.AT]`
[6] X. Dong. *Alexander duality for projections of polytopes.* Topology 41 (2002), No. 6, 1109-1121.
[7] C.P. Rourke, B.J. Sanderson. *Introduction to piecewise-linear topology.* Springer-Verlag (1972).
[8] F. Santos, B. Sturmfels. *Alexander duality in subdivisions of Lawrence polytopes.* Adv. Geom. 3 (2003), No. 2, 177-189.

Departamento de Matemática-IMAS, FCEyN, Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
E-mail address: `ncapitel@dm.uba.ar`